

## REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 18, and 20-22 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1-15, 18, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,412,004 Chen et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,385,596 to Wiser et al., and claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Wiser and U.S. Patent No. 6,209,787 to Liada. With this amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, and 18 are amended, claims 3, 4, 6-8, and 22 are canceled, and new claims 23-27 are added. As explained below, all of the claims, as presently amended, are patentable over the cited references.

The claims recite the delivery of media data using one or more meta data servers, where a client obtains meta data from a meta data server and then uses that meta data to obtain media data from a media data server. As amended, the claims recite limitations in which the meta data server is “on a media network managed by a media service provider” and the media data server is “separate from the media network and controlled by a media data owner independent of the media service provider.” This distributed media network configuration allows a media service provider to operate and maintain the media network (e.g., the client device, the meta data server, and the meta data databases). In this way, the media service provider controls client access to the media by managing the meta data servers. At the same time, the owners of the media data retain control over their media data files by storing those files on media data servers that they control, independent of the media service provider. The media data owners thus benefit from the speed and ease in which they can add and remove their files on the system, while the media

service provider can manage access to those files by a client using the media network.

(Specification, p. 5, lines 22-32.)

Dependent claims further refine this concept. For example, the media data files may be unusable without encryption keys and/or additional portions of media data. In such a case, the meta data server managed by the media service provider transmits to the clients the required encryption key and/or meta data for accessing the additional portion of the media data. This gives the media service provider additional control over client access to the media data, even though the media service provider does not actually control the media data servers.

None of cited references nor their combination disclose or suggest these claimed features. Chen describes a system in which a metaserver manages the delivery of multimedia data streams to a number of clients. Chen is directed to reducing bottlenecks and dealing with network faults, not to protecting media data from unauthorized use. (Chen col. 1, lines 30-37.) Chen does not address the issue of which entities control or manage the meta data and the media data servers or networks, nor does Chen suggest the claimed arrangement.

Wiser discloses a system for distributing media, but Wiser does not disclose the claimed invention. Specifically, Wiser shows a single Media Distribution Center (see FIG. 1) that receives requests for media from a client, provides the client with a voucher for retrieving the media, and then manages the delivery of the media to the client. (Wiser, col. 18, line 60 to col. 19, line 43; FIG. 9B.) Accordingly, not only does Wiser not describe the claimed distributed media network, its disclosure of a centralized Media Distribution Center that handles all of the media distribution tasks actually teaches away from the claimed invention.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the examiner believes for any reason

direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,  
NICHOLAS WILLIAM SINCAGLIA ET AL.

Dated: November 12, 2003

By: Robert A. Hulse

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473  
Attorney for Applicant  
Fenwick & West LLP  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (415) 875-2444  
Fax: (415) 281-1350